

E 3562

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — Extensions of Remarks

June 23, 1976

fluence of the shadowy forces in our state. His penetrating revelations had not just thrown darts at well-known villains but had embarrassed many would-be heroes. The real impact of wrongdoing will never be recognized and remedied until the leadership of the community is prepared to expose and counter the bad deeds of the "good" people as well as of the "bad" people. And so, as of now, Don Bolles has received his reward for his efforts. And unless all of us are prepared to do more, his reward may well become the reward of anyone courageous and persistent enough to hit the nerve endings of the cozy compatibility of respectability, wealth and power with the elements so widely declaimed.

Does the continued survival and apparent success of so-called organized crime evidence the incompetence and ignorance of those who lead the fight to exterminate it? Or does it show that these "bad guys" have learned all too well how to exploit the faults and weaknesses of the rest of us?

What has happened to Don Bolles is tragic. It is a great personal tragedy for him and his family. It is a great public tragedy that such an event can happen. It will become a far greater personal and public tragedy if it succeeds in its purpose. If the reaction to its horror is but a temporary sensation, and does not catalyze this state and its citizens to a sincere and forceful commitment to rid our society of its cause, the lesson will be clear: Violence succeeds. Efforts to expose and fight organized crime are simply not worth the trouble, and dangerous to boot. In the end, the bad people will succeed because the good people don't really care.

We cannot believe that this will be the result of a scorching attack upon our free press. We must expect this state to ignore or forgo this cowardly blow delivered against our society as a whole. If this does not crystallize our complaints and cynicisms into indignation and determination, we will be surprised and disappointed.

None of us can restore Don's leg or remove the physical and emotional suffering he has experienced. But each of us can play a role in giving meaning and purpose to his sacrifice.

Editor's note: Mrs. Barnes is a former editor of the San City Citizen and was a reporter five years for The Arizona Republic.

## SEE YOU AT THE TOP

HON. PETE V. DOMENICI

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 23, 1976

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, my good friend, former Congressman Ed Foreman, who is now with the Department of Transportation as a Regional Director, brought to my attention a book that demands attention from my colleagues.

This book, "See You at the Top," was written by Zig Ziglar of Dallas, Tex., and has received a tremendous response from businessmen, housewives, teachers, and the full range of citizens who have come in contact with it.

Ziglar devotes much of his text toward motivating young people in particular to channel their talents and energy into chores that will create for themselves a richer, fuller life. Many teachers have purchased this book and requested permission to use it as a approved complete in itself. Ziglar himself has started put-

ting together such a complete course in personal growth and calls it, "The Richer Life Course."

Ziglar's excellent speaking ability and wide experience, sharing the platform with such notables as Gen. Chappie James, Norman Vincent Peale, Congressman Foreman, and others, gives him a truly motivational ability.

Behind this book is Ziglar's belief that a healthy self-image is the key to success and happiness. He teaches that your personal attitude controls your circumstances and that you can carve out your own destiny. The book deals with solutions to many of America's problems—pornography, alcoholism, declining faith in leadership, a national failure of will in some areas.

Because Ziglar puts the stress on what an individual can do to make himself, and his society, better, I believe that his efforts are destined to succeed. His notion that one gets from life what one is willing to give may be ancient in concept, but its validity has never been questioned. Moreover Ziglar has adorned this precept with a humorous and unique style that makes his book both readable and educational.

I congratulate Mr. Ziglar on his efforts and recommend his work to all of my colleagues.

## EXPANDING THE ROLE OF NURSES

HON. ANTHONY TOBY MOFFETT

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1976

Mr. MOFFETT. Mr. Speaker, health costs and health care are topics of major concern, both in my own State of Connecticut and in most other regions of the Nation. As we consider the appropriations measure funding the Departments of Labor and HEW, I urge my colleagues to note the committee's decision to include funds for nurse practitioner training. The nurse practitioner concept is designed to help relieve the pressures that are forcing costs upward and service downward.

I want to emphasize the importance of expanding the role of nurses, a concept that is vital to the improvement of health care in America. The nurse practitioner movement, simply put, enables nurses to administer primary care to patients, often without a doctor's direct involvement. I am most pleased that the Appropriations Committee, despite pressures from the administration, saw fit to continue and expand this approach to health care, along with funding advanced training programs within HEW's Division of Nursing.

There are some seven thousand nurse practitioners now in the United States. Particularly in rural areas, these nurses are often the only available source of health care.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure all of us recognize the need for adequate maternal and child health care programs. In these times of high unemployment, the health needs of expectant mothers and their infants are a high priority. It is not a replacement of funding priorities or a callous bu-

reaucrat or White House functionary. State grants and project grants are of vital importance to this program. I support the efforts of the House Committee on Appropriations; I know they have faced a difficult task, and I urge the House to back their efforts.

LT. GEN. SAMUEL V. WILSON

HON. DAN DANIEL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1976

Mr. DAN DANIEL. Mr. Speaker, most—if not all—of our colleagues in this body are acquainted with Lt. Gen. Samuel V. Wilson, Director of the Defense Intelligence Agency.

Many may not know, however, that he is southside Virginian, having been born and brought up in Prince Edward County, where he has a farm and his family resides most of the year. I therefore feel a special kinship. The kinship was further strengthened during the Vietnam war, when we shared the experience of having our plane hit by small arms fire down in the delta.

Sam Wilson is a man created for the jobs he has held. It is not possible to know him without associating such words as "character," "integrity," and "dedication" with his name. These are qualities he has displayed in every position he has held, and a finer example of each could not be found.

Recently, I obtained a copy of his remarks before the West Texas Chamber of Commerce when he held a different assignment, and I now insert in the RECORD, so that all may read them:

REMARKS BY LT. GEN. SAMUEL V. WILSON, BEFORE THE WEST TEXAS CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

You do me and my family honor to have me here today. My boss, Bill Colby, deeply regretted that he could not attend, but I am sure that you must all be aware of the unusually heavy demands being made on his time right now.

Just so you will know what you got in exchange, let me explain who and what I am. I am a farm boy from Southside Virginia (and we all say that most good Texans are transplanted Virginians, beginning with Sam Houston). So I kind of feel at home with you here. I also work for you as a soldier. My title is deputy to the Director of Central Intelligence for the intelligence community. That mouthful means that I am, in effect, the director's chief of staff for foreign intelligence matters affecting more than one agency or department.

You should also know that I am not a professional intelligence officer. I am a troop commander, and although I have occasionally had some dealings with intelligence in the past, it has largely been as one who was receiving intelligence rather than giving it.

I've been with Mr. Colby and the intelligence community for a little more than a year now. In some ways, I speak to you from the viewpoint of an "outsider" in the intelligence business, but with the clear advantage of having had a very deep look at it in the last year.

I'm not here today to talk with you about the structure of the US foreign intelligence life subjects that require elaborate—and very dull—organiza-

June 23, 1976

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — Extensions of Remarks

E 3561

But Secretary Kissinger, during his African visit, announced the Ford administration's determination to "urge Congress this year to repeal the Byrd amendment."

The result of the amendment's repeal would be to increase economic pressure on the Rhodesians. But it would also be to make the United States almost wholly dependent upon the Soviet Union for an essential ingredient for its steel industry.

There is reason to doubt whether Congress will—or should—do so. Senator Byrd himself takes the position that "we're spending \$100 billion a year to defend ourselves against Russia" and that "Russia is our only potential adversary. And yet, before my amendment was passed, we would have depended on Russia for virtually all of a critical strategic material."

The issue of Rhodesian chrome, lamentably, has become inseparable from the ritualistic game that has come to influence more and more of the nation's foreign-policy decisions—cast to which Secretary Kissinger appears to have succumbed during his African journey.

The decision on chrome needs to be made not on the basis of what will prove pleasing to this or that power bloc in the nation's dramatic political wars, but on the basis of the nation's long-term welfare.

**WDIA RADIO—MEMPHIS, TENN., A HISTORY OF COMMUNITY SERVICE**

**BY HAROLD E. FORD**

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1976

Mr. FORD of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues the fine work being done by radio station WDIA in Memphis, Tenn. No other station in the mid-South has generated so many varied acts of goodwill toward any community, be it black or white. This Saturday, June 26, the station will present the 20th annual Starlite Revue. The revue is one of two soul music charity spectacles sponsored each year by WDIA. The receipts from the revue are used to fund the station's many community activities.

The list of WDIA's charity credits is awesome. The station supports more than 100 little league baseball teams or over 2000 young ballplayers. It has funded the Dixie Homes Goodwill Boys' Club and the St. Thomas Girls' Club. WDIA founded the Keel School for Handicapped Black Children and provides transportation for handicapped children in the city. The station has established a \$5,000 scholarship fund for high school students and contributes to the United Negro College Fund. The College Chapel Health Center has received \$10,000 from WDIA and the station has pledged \$40,000 more. The list of charitable activities could go on and on. I know of no other radio station that is as actively involved in community service as is WDIA.

The work of WDIA has not gone unnoticed by the professionals in the music business. In 1969 Billboard Magazine presented WDIA with their Station of the Year Award citing "its dramatic efforts to raise the social, educational, and lit-

ing standards of its audience" as the basis for the honor. The following year, The National Association of Television and Radio Announcers voted WDIA the award of Radio Station of the Year.

In the past 25 years WDIA has witnessed the intricate changes in black music and the dramatic developments in the black community. WDIA has never exploited its large black audience, but chose instead to accommodate it. It is one of those very rare stations that honestly cares for the black population it serves. WDIA, through its great programming and unequalled history of community service, has provided a standard of excellence for radio stations around the country.

**CHUCK WALLIS HONORED WITH AWARD**

**HON. WILLIAM F. WALSH**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1976

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, tonight in Penn. Yan. N.Y., a very fine gentleman is being honored by his community as "Rotarian of the Year." I fully realize that many honors are bestowed upon Americans in their own communities each year, and everyone honored deserves the recognition given. In this particular instance, however, the individual I speak of is very special indeed to his community and our country.

Charles L. Wallis, known to me and his many friends as "Chuck," is a most unique person. He is the pastor of his church in the community of Keuka Park, teaches English at Keuka College, has written over 30 books that have been published and, in his spare time, leads the political party of his choice as its county chairman.

As a spiritual director, he has guided and directed the lives of thousands in the ways of their Creator.

As a teacher and educator, he has helped shape the destiny of many students by his image, by his character, and by his example.

As an author and publisher of religious articles and other subjects, he has brought comfort and peace of mind to thousands.

As a political leader, he has been equitable in listening to all points of view.

Never has an honor been more deserved. Chuck has given so unselfishly of his time and his many talents to do many worthwhile endeavors that a list of these would almost be endless.

After a long day on the floor of the House, I have often returned to my apartment very weary. Awaiting me on several occasions have been delightful letters or cartoons sent to me by Chuck that would bring a smile to my face. This is what he does for so many—gives of himself without asking for anything in return.

In this very small way I wish to congratulate my friend Chuck Wallis for a job well done. May he and his lovely wife

Betty, continue in good health in the years ahead.

For having the privilege of knowing Chuck Wallis, a man whose example has been an inspiration to all of us, I consider myself a very fortunate man.

**WILL SOCIETY BE BIG LOSER IN BOLLES FAMILY TRAGEDY?**

**HON. SAM STEIGER**

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1976

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, on June 2, Don Bolles, a reporter for the Arizona Republic, suffered injuries from a bomb planted beneath his car. The injuries proved fatal 12 days later. Mr. Bolles was a long-time friend of mine and was recognized as one of the best investigative reporters in the country.

Three days before Mr. Bolles' death in a Phoenix hospital, Jack Pryor, publisher of the weekly Sun City Citizen in Sun City, Ariz., printed on the front page of his paper an editorial written by Mrs. Patricia Barnes. I include the editorial in the Record:

**WILL SOCIETY BE BIG LOSER IN BOLLES FAMILY TRAGEDY?**

(By Patricia Barnes)

Was Don Bolles right? Does he not care? His Arizona Republic colleague, Bernie Wynn, said Don had become cynical after years of laboring to expose the evils of organized crime in Arizona. Cynical because nothing was done about it. Now Don is fighting for his life, minus one leg and 30 pints of blood. At least his blood is replaceable.

But why had Don become cynical?

Why not? Arizona is the state where Attorneys General are elected on a promise to seek out and prosecute organized crime; County Attorneys are elected on the same promise;

We spend days at blue-ribbon Town Hall discussions where prominent citizens of the state talk about the malignancy of organized crimes;

A Phoenix 40 is wormed where an evermore self-inflating group can continue to talk about "getting tough" on organized crime;

Congressman Steiger attempts to show mob influence in Arizona and eventually achieves the reputation of a common cold for his efforts, because too many prominent citizens could be involved and that would embarrass other politicians, financial institutions, law firms and the business community;

A past Attorney General admits he had a gambling habit which he indulged in frequent trips to Las Vegas;

The State Legislature creates a statewide Grand Jury as a panacea for the state's criminal ills and then spends a year arguing over whether or not it should be given money with which to operate;

Key witnesses in land fraud cases are first disposed of via "convenient accidents" and later brazenly murdered.

A cynic may well wonder if all the pompous proclamations about fighting crime are intended to help expose it or to conceal it, to rally the public against it or to lull the public into complacency.

Don Bolles was one of the few people who had not just talked and written but had actually done things that affected the in-

June 23, 1976

Approved For Release 2003/01/29 : CIA-RDP79M00467A000400020005-1

CONFIDENTIAL RECORD — Extensions of Remarks

E 3563

tional charts. There are some far more fundamental things on my mind, and I think that they are concerns that you share.

For many months now you have been treated to daily and nightly horror stories and exposes about the US foreign intelligence community on your television sets and in your newspapers and magazines. We have been charged with nearly every offense in the book, from "massive" domestic spying to being unable to warn our nation of impending attack.

All too often only the accusations and allegations make headlines, and the denial and truth of the matter never seem to be heard. I hope that the American public will not come to believe unfounded allegations simply because they have been repeated so often.

That technique works in closed societies, but we should not allow it to work here.

To provide a setting for my remarks, let me briefly outline the problem as it affects your foreign intelligence establishment today.

The U.S. foreign intelligence community and particularly the Central Intelligence Agency are right in the middle of a White House-Capitol Hill tug-of-war. There are issues of course, but to a degree we are caught up in the power dynamics of the checks and balances system at work.

To a number of us it would appear that the public media tilt toward Capitol Hill . . . perhaps because the offensive is newsworthy.

The temptation is strong for some politicians to exploit the situation to their own benefit.

A number of the concerns expressed regarding our past and potential abuses are real and must be dealt with.

The competence and effectiveness of the U.S. foreign intelligence effort are coming under attack. There is the charge of intelligence failure, that our intelligence is not worth the cost.

Now, I firmly believe we will come out all right in the end—a few months from now—with better, more explicit legislation, Joint Oversight Committees in Congress with tighter procedures. The rights of citizens under 1st and 4th constitutional amendments will continue to be protected, and we will go on.

There is great danger in the interim period, however.

We fear the unnecessary revealing and therefore compromise of sensitive intelligence, sources and methods.

The signs of approaching crises conceivably could be missed because of senior management's preoccupation with Congress and the press.

There is a deteriorating morale situation throughout the intelligence community, especially in the CIA.

We are concerned lest overly proscriptive and/or unsound legislation be developed for the future and so constrain our activities that we cannot carry them out effectively.

Our job in the next few months is to emerge from this crisis in intelligence with a workable institution without doing irreparable damage in the process.

I hope—in fact, I am certain—that no one in this room doubts the need for America to have a strong intelligence service. Some few in our country apparently do doubt it. Others say they believe in one, but they would so expose and hamstring it that it could not operate effectively. Still others, who favor an effective intelligence service, question whether our service is properly controlled and properly focused. We listen carefully to the latter.

Some responsible people feel the intelligence community itself has been the cause of some of these doubts. The old traditions

were of total secrecy and silence. One year ago, this talk would not have been given. These traditions are now under attack because many fear that they have been used to cover abuses.

We do not condone abuses. We must not call upon secrecy to hide failures or wrongs in our past. President Ford and Mr. Colby have clearly given us our marching orders on this.

But when, for example, an operation that involved three agents is proclaimed as "massive," when the normal loan of CIA employees to other Government agencies at the latter's request is called "infiltration," or when conspiracy theorists mouth CIA complicity in the assassination of President Kennedy despite flat and factual denials, then the American people are understandably troubled.

Let me say it straight. We who serve you in the American foreign intelligence ranks are also Americans. As I used to respond to my Soviet interlocutors in Moscow: "Ya Americansky patriot!" "I am an American patriot!" When I wanted to make doubly sure I got the point across, I would answer: "Ya Americansky revoliutsionaire!"—"I am an American revolutionary!" and that's the subject for a different speech. I would simply remind you that Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin do not come off very well in a debate with John Locke, Voltaire, Tom Paine, Sam Adams, Jefferson, Madison, Lincoln, and Woodrow Wilson. We, not they, are the real revolutionaries and we have been enjoying the fruits of our revolution for two centuries—that is what your intelligence service strives to protect. There is nothing I want more than to ensure that the rights and privileges of American citizens are kept secure. That is what the game is all about. That is why we serve. That is why I am in uniform. To charge that we would seek to endanger your freedom is utter nonsense.

Let me focus on something else. The United States intelligence community itself brought out and exposed the missteps and improprieties of the past 28 years. In 1973, the director of central intelligence set out clear directives that any activities not in full compliance with the laws of the United States would cease immediately. They have stopped. We ourselves came forward and gave our investigators the results of our own self-examinations and what we had done about our findings. Now we are being hit over the head with facts that we ourselves provided voluntarily.

Another fact. Against the service our intelligence has rendered the nation over the past 28 years, those improprieties were truly few and far between. Less—I would submit—than any other agency of government. I also believe that such missteps as there were must be looked at in the context of the times. Many of you here are like me. You remember the Second World War, Korea, and the Cold War. It is not easy to explain to people who didn't live through it, just what Pearl Harbor meant to America and the strength of our national commitment never to be taken by surprise again. It is equally hard to recall the days of the Cold War and the strength of our commitment to stopping "the Communist menace."

Times change. The national point of view changes. Some of our national values may change. We should not, however, use our changed values to make scapegoats of the dedicated men and women of the intelligence community who serve their country in an anonymous and demanding craft.

Yesterday I was coming through the main entrance into the CIA headquarters building at Langley, Virginia. On the wall to the right in the main entrance hall a number of stars have been chisled into the marble, one for each CIA public servant who gave his life for

his country. The last time I had counted there were thirty stars. Yesterday there were 31.

Now, a lot of us consider that the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier is in human terms our saddest, our most touching national monument—an unknown soldier—"known but to God." I am here to tell you that the effect of the simple inscription on CIA's marble wall is equally moving. For 15 of the 31 stars we show no names; yet we know who they are. Their names are not shown because we must continue to keep secret, to protect what they were doing and to keep from hostile view those still alive and carrying on the vital purposes for which these fallen heroes sacrificed themselves.

Of course, America cannot and must never allow abuses in its intelligence services. Abuses must be identified and ended. We have identified and ended them. You have been told about them! We told you! You must now ask yourselves whether it serves your interests—America's interests—to expose intelligence secrets and activities that are valid, yes, critical, and that have nothing to do with "abuses."

We do not oppose investigation. We welcome it. But just as intelligence must be responsible, investigation must be responsible. The investigations of the intelligence community now under way have as their primary aim recommendations for executive and legislative actions to ensure that American intelligence fits American standards.

The laws that created much of our national security structure were purposely left vague back in 1947. The Director of Central Intelligence has recommended tightening those laws so that the charter of the CIA specifically refers to "foreign" intelligence. Other changes may also be desirable to clarify lines of command and authority within and among members of the intelligence community. Again, we welcome such changes. But change must also be responsible, not simply change for cosmetic or political reasons.

I've used the word "responsible" a number of times in the last minute or so. As I said, you as American citizens have every right to expect your intelligence service to be responsible, to protect yourselves and your country. But that responsibility cuts both ways. Senseless exposure of America's true intelligence secrets can cause great damage. Our adversaries find it all too easy to close the chinks in their armor when we obligingly make them public. As Mr. Colby has said, security must not be sacrificed for sensationalism. Protection must not be jeopardized by publicity.

The revelation of true intelligence secrets makes exciting reading in the morning paper. It is soon forgotten by most readers, but not by our adversaries. Enormously complex and expensive technical intelligence collection systems can be countered. Dedicated and courageous men and women who risk their lives to help America can be exposed and destroyed. I don't think the American people want this to happen; especially when our adversaries, dedicated to the proposition that we eventually must be defeated, are hard at work.

There is one charge in particular against the intelligence community that I want to talk about. You've heard a lot about "intelligence failures." You've been told that the American taxpayer is not getting his money's worth for his intelligence dollar. You've been told that American intelligence cannot warn of imminent attack.

Now that just makes me mad! They say: "Victory has a thousand fathers, defeat is an orphan." In intelligence we say: "Our defeats and mistakes are trumpeted; our successes pass unnoticed and unknown."

I am here to tell you that America has

Approved For Release 2003/01/29 : CIA-RDP79M00467A000400020005-1

good intelligence—the best in the world. It is time to say: Our country is safe from a sneak attack. It is time to say: Our country is getting a bargain for its intelligence buck. It is time to say: The American intelligence record is studded with success after success.

It is time to say:

That American intelligence spotted the Soviet nuclear missile being delivered to Cuba in 1962 and supported the President as he worked through 13 nightmarish days to force their removal.

That American intelligence gave seven years warning on the development of the Moscow anti-ballistic missile system.

That American intelligence pinpointed eight new Soviet inter-continental ballistic missiles and evaluated the development of each three or more years before it became operational.

That two major new Soviet submarine programs were anticipated well before the first boats slid down the ways.

That we knew the status and design of two Soviet aircraft carriers well before the front was put to sea for sea trials.

Those are all military concerns, and they are crucial. But what of other intelligence areas?

American intelligence successfully monitors and predicts trends in oil prices and trends in the flow of petro dollars. That impinges on your pocketbook and on your every-day life.

American intelligence each year turns the key task of assessing world crop prospects. That has to do with the price of the market basket we all must buy, with the world food problem.

American intelligence monitors compliance with the strategic arms limitation agreements. We do not have to estimate. We do not have to guess. We know whether possible adversaries are keeping these agreements. This is a job for intelligence: keeping the peace and restraining the arms race.

I hope these illustrations help you to understand the intelligence community and its job just a bit better. Many years ago, Allen Dulles spoke of the "craft" of intelligence. He underplayed it. The bold technical thinkers, the brave people on hazardous duty in strange lands; the gifted analysts puzzling out mysterious political and military moves made by unpredictable people in far and closed societies: these are more than crafts-men.

Intelligence is more than a craft. It is more than a science. It is also an art. We do not have a crystal ball, and we can't yet give you a copy of the 1980 World Almanac. And we may not predict the given hour of a particular coup or revolution. Any more than your weatherman can make a flat prediction that it will start raining at precisely 0920 hours tomorrow. We can't tell you what God is going to do on Tuesday of next week. Especially when He hasn't made up his mind. But we probably can tell you when He's getting mad.

But that kind of prediction is not the main mission of intelligence. Our primary function is to provide the leadership of this Nation with the deepest possible understanding of the military, political, social, and economic climate of countries that affect vital American interests. Our mission is to see that our leaders know about what may happen in the world beyond our borders and about the forces and factors at work there. That is what intelligence is really all about. And we do it well, despite our current problems.

In front of the CIA Headquarters Building at Langley, Virginia, stands a statue of one of our famous Revolutionary War heroes—Nathan Hale. A close look at him shows his hands are tied behind him and his legs are bound with a rope, just as he was bound before the Redcoats hung him for attempting to steal their secrets.

Now, I have come down here to ask your support: Help us get the ropes off of Nathan Hale.

## CHALLENGES OF GENERAL AVIATION

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1976

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, the aviation industry is an economic mainstay of my district. Because it is so important, new developments in aviation, anticipated problems for aviation, potential benefits for aviation—all are major news items within my district.

Just as I am enlightened each day by Members of this body who speak for industries of international importance with which I am not personally familiar, I would like to take this opportunity to share some information that has come to my attention with regard to the general aviation industry.

Mr. Russell W. Meyer, Jr., chairman of Cessna Aircraft Co. of Wichita, Kans., recently addressed a conference of Federal Aviation Administration executives on the subject of challenges confronting general aviation manufacturers of America. As Mr. Meyer pointed out, some of the challenges of aviation are challenges within the industry—but a significant proportion of them are challenges issued or forthcoming from Congress or the Federal regulatory agencies.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include excerpts from Mr. Meyer's address:

### CHALLENGES OF GENERAL AVIATION

(By Russell W. Meyer, Jr.)

Where are we today in general aviation? We're coming off two very good years. This favorable performance was achieved in spite of economic problems which reached every area of the world. We haven't grown by chance or because of reductions in airline service. General aviation has grown because of substantial progress in a number of areas:

(1) There's no question that today's airplanes are better than ever, in every respect. Better fuel efficiency. Greater flexibility. Pressurization has been an important factor. Cabin sound levels have been improved by both propeller and engine refinements.

(2) Airport development and facilities improvement provide landing alternatives at major cities, and air transportation to thousands of communities not served by airlines.

(3) Our safety record has improved almost every year. We're not perfect, but we're proud of continued, steady progress.

(4) Perhaps the most important factor is dependability. When you have to travel, you want to be able to depend on a schedule. We've made great strides in this area. General aviation aircraft have become integrated systems, with vastly improved avionics, and equipment like digital radar, and automatic flight control systems. This equipment is now being installed on thousands of new aircraft. The Air Traffic Control system is better and pilot training is more thorough. As a result, rapidly increasing numbers of general aviation aircraft are operating safely and dependably in the transportation system.

Because of this progress, our industry delivered 14,000 units in 1974, and the same number in 1975. We projected 15,000 units in 1976. With 5,389 deliveries in four months, that projection may be low.

To evaluate the future requires an understanding of history and an accurate review of the current status. Several historical observations on our industry are relevant:

world's general aviation industry, having achieved a market share of well over 90%.

Quantitatively, this has resulted in a substantial contribution to U.S. balance of trade.

Qualitatively, this has meant that U.S. products have been an essential part of the air transportation systems of practically every country in the world.

We've dominated the world's market for two major reasons: (1) We have a strong domestic market which has enabled the industry to grow more rapidly than other countries; (2) We have worked closely with the FAA to achieve high standards in both aircraft manufacturing and flight operation. It has been a cooperative form of regulation, and one which has been effective because of the commonality of our objectives: aviation safety and technological progress.

Looking beyond 1978, we think we have the potential to grow to a level of at least 20,000 units by 1980. That's a rate of about 7 percent per year. There is no doubt in our mind that the market is there; throughout the world. The question is not market potential, but whether or not we will have the governmental environment to enable us to be strong enough to take advantage of it. And that brings me to the major challenges of general aviation.

We believe these challenges can be grouped into six categories: energy, environment, product liability, the export market, airport facilities, and the cost of flying. Let's take them one at a time.

(1) *Energy.* It's ironic that the crisis which really focused attention on the efficiencies of general aviation aircraft in the first place also represents the ominous threat of potential disaster. I'm talking, of course, about the fuel situation. It's almost inconceivable that our government has not planned and implemented a more effective national fuel conservation program. I believe everyone in the country was willing and even anxious to assist in cutting down energy consumption in late '73 and early '74. Lights were being turned off, unnecessary trips cancelled, and car pools were started. But the leadership disappeared and we are living in a world bordering on madness where energy is concerned. There's no meaningful program to conserve it; no federal encouragement to produce it. Although FAA has reported the positive results of general aviation fuel conservation, the fact remains that we need fuel to fly—and we continue to urge—to plead with Congress and the Administration to formulate an adequate U.S. energy program.

(2) *Environment.* The major environmental concerns, with respect to general aviation, are (a) engine emission standards established by EPA, and (b) airplane noise, from the standpoint of both aircraft manufacture and operation. On the subject of engine emissions, we have finally made some headway with EPA, but we still have a long way to go. The initial piston engine proposals would have put us out of business in 1979. Without commenting upon the basic insignificance of piston engine emissions, since it seems we are going to be regulated regardless of that fact, our primary problem was initially one of communication. Recent meetings indicate that coordination between industry, FAA, and EPA is improving. We still believe the problem should be carefully defined before a solution is proposed. Above all, EPA must understand the complex nature and practical aspects of aviation. Engineering a change on an airplane engine requires strenuous type testing under FAA regulations. It is a costly, time-consuming, necessary process, because aircraft safety and reliability are absolutely essential considerations.

The subject of aircraft noise has been controversial from the time Part 36 was conceived. It boiled down to a case of starting somewhere and Part 36 is where we are. I don't think anyone would disagree that aircraft noise is a problem, but it's one which we need to determine



active member of the President's Regulatory Reform Task Force. But economic adviser MacAvoy says the problem goes far deeper than that. He says: "There has been an inability to demonstrate the impact of OSEA on the basis of reduced accident rates. My only concern is whether OSEA can be made effective and at less cost."

For his part, Corn maintains that no matter how much time, money, and effort it takes to make OSEA an optimum performer, it would still be more efficient to revamp the agency than to eliminate it. As he sums it up: "It would be foolish to scrap what we have just to try something else."

### THE CONGRESS AND INTELLIGENCE

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, Congress has subjected the Central Intelligence Agency to close and merciless scrutiny through a variety of select committees, plus comparable inquiries into policies and expenditures by the committees of Congress regularly constituted to oversee the operations of the CIA. As a result, there is gnawing fear that the CIA has been left a shambles and that its effectiveness, at least temporarily, is seriously damaged. Some elements of the press have apparently sought to utilize the disclosures to publicly hang, draw and quarter the CIA.

Sea Power for June 1976 contains an effective discussion of this subject entitled, "The Congress and Intelligence." It provides important reading for Congress, and I include the excerpts from the article at this point in the Record:

#### THE CONGRESS AND INTELLIGENCE

(By Lawrence Griswold)

(The terms are not necessarily incompatible, nor are they always mutually exclusive.)

The apparently endless investigations by both Houses of Congress of the U.S. intelligence services seem now at least temporarily concluded, but it will be years, if ever, before a valid, final post-mortem damage report can be issued.

Those conducting the investigations, bravely trying to put the best face on what has been a chaotic and sometimes incomprehensible charade, assert that their efforts will insure that the Central Intelligence Agency and its bureaucratic minions will from now on be even more responsive in carrying out their various missions, and without a repeat of the alleged former excesses.

It has yet to be proven, however, that the best way to improve a bad boy is to whip him in public, expose him to shame, ridicule, and censure day after day in the print and broadcast media, and then send him forth, properly chastened and equipped only with the Marquis of Queensberry Rules, to do bloody battle with a world full of bare-knuckles, knee-in-the-groin alley fighters.

#### DAMAGE ASSESSMENT

But if the long-term "benefits" which might develop from the intelligence investigations presently appear extremely questionable, there are at least two shorter-term results about which there should be no question whatsoever:

(1) The U.S. intelligence community has been severely damaged in numerous respects—beginning with the assassination of Richard Welch in Athens, extending to and beyond the general sapping of morale throughout the entire U.S. intelligence es-

tablishment, and culminating in the effective drying up of valuable sources and contacts all over the world. As David Atlee Phillips, former Chief of Latin American and Caribbean Operations for the CIA's Operations Directorate, expressed it in the April 1976 issue of *The Retired Officer*: "The end result [of the Congressional investigations]... may very well be an intelligence apparatus that is no longer able to operate effectively. It has lost the trust of friendly services in allied countries and hence the shared products of their activities. It will be a community robbed of the capability to obtain information from human agents because they refuse to entrust their knowledge and their lives to agencies whose innermost secrets appear in the press on a daily basis."

(2) The U.S. Congress itself, for all its presumed good intentions in carrying out the investigations, has been damaged much more—by the now celebrated Daniel Schorr/Village Voice connection; by the continuing series of distortions, innuendoes, and false and inflammatory statements which characterized so much of the investigations (and the reporting thereof by the mass media); by the unauthorized release of information to the press by staff and committee members alike, which started as tiny leaks but quickly escalated into rivulets, rivers, and floods; and, finally, by the unprecedented twin spectacles of one Congressman (Representative Michael J. Harrington of Massachusetts) revealing highly classified information about CIA operations in Chile (and thus "becoming," as Phillips noted, "the first Congressman in history to violate a signed secrecy agreement pledging to protect the confidentiality of that information"), and another (Representative Otis Pike of New York) being finally repudiated by Congress itself when he tried to include in his committee report other information which the committee had obtained from the Executive Branch only after promising the President it would not be made public.

#### ARROWS AND ERRORS

That Congress has damaged itself more than the CIA with its ill-aimed arrows and errors represents at best, however, a Pyrrhic victory for those who initially opposed the investigations and/or who attempted in various ways either to limit their scope or to insure they proceeded along constructive lines. No matter what one's opinion about the Legislative Branch of government—and the general public's opinion, according to all recent polls, gives Congress a very low rating indeed—any diminution of respect for any branch or institution of government translates, in a very real sense, into a tragic loss for all Americans.

Without in any way whitewashing or condoning the CIA, et al. for the now well-publicized misdeeds of yesterday, it can be noted that the washing of dirty linen in public is not necessarily the best way, or most intelligent way, to cleanse the stains of the past.

It certainly is not the only way.

The process of assaying the essential realities of a potential enemy's capabilities and intentions demands a lapidarian's exquisite precision; if that is lacking, the result, with information fed into the computer together with its associated data, may be fantastically wrong.

Thus far, the record of the CIA has been excellent—allegations to the contrary notwithstanding. Earlier successes included the timely warnings of Russian aggression against the Turkish and Greek governments (which brought about the defensive U.S. reaction then called the Marshall Plan) and advance information about the launching of Russia's Berlin Blockade in 1948. More recently, the dispatch of Russian missiles in Cuba and advance preparations for North Vietnam's Tet offensive were spotted in time

to be successfully countered (the latter intelligence gave the U.S. Marines enough latitude to set up a defense in depth at the precise point chosen for the hostile attack in their area).

#### THE CLOSED BOOK

Scores of similar if less spectacular CIA plusses could be educed if Langley would open its books; its refusal to do so is necessary for the security of Americans and NATO allies still in the field. Hostile counter-intelligence is as alert as the CIA's own less numerous and more restricted forces; published references to places and dates could easily expose valuable agents to capture, and would mean failure of many vital missions.

Intelligence activities can be thwarted in other ways, also—as they were when, in 1974, and in what many thought was an usurpation of Executive Branch power, Congress cut off pledged arms to Turkey, thus (unwittingly, perhaps), blinding American observation of Russian military operations in the Turkish Straits, the Black Sea, and that part of the Russian land mass just north of Turkey.

Congress has, of course, not been alone in its condemnation of the CIA; the mass media also deserve much of the credit, or blame. It was, after all, the lengthy series of leaks fed to an avid press between 1968 and 1971, culminating in the theft and distribution of the "Pentagon Papers" by Daniel Ellsberg, which led to formation of the White House group known as the "Plumbers"—which in turn led to Watergate and all that followed.

That the CIA and the FBI erred, sometimes grievously (but almost always from zeal, rather than venality), in carrying out their many delicate assigned missions, is not in dispute. That strong guidance and control from the Executive Branch—the President, specifically, acting with the advice and consent of Congress—is necessary, is obvious.

That Congress can and should must carry out its own oversight activities—preferably through a select joint committee comprised of a limited number of Representatives and Senators of the highest personal integrity (a quality which includes the apparently rare legislative ability to keep secrets)—is also obvious.

What is not at all obvious, to friend or foe of the United States alike, is whether the present U.S. Congress has in fact carried out its own duties in the delicate field of intelligence either from the loftiest non-partisan motives or with the best results.

Americans, including American Congressmen, have notoriously short memories. The turmoil of the Vietnam years, the anti-war riots and demonstrations which terrified so many Americans and which undoubtedly weakened the U.S. war effort, the outrageous and, some would say, openly treasonous statements made by American citizens abroad, and the several real and numerous threatened assassinations which punctuated the late 1960s and early 1970s all have seemingly now been forgotten.

Also forgotten sometimes is that the United States is not without enemies in the world. And enemies need watching.

Despite Congressional assertions to the contrary, it is doubtful whether the CIA and its sister agencies will for the foreseeable future be able to watch America's enemies, foreign and domestic, as well or as carefully as they were able to prior to the start of the intelligence investigations.

In seeking to rectify the past, Congress may well have harmfully infringed on the nation's requirements for the future.

### TRIBUTE TO LATE HONORABLE CARROLL D. KEARNS OF PENNSYLVANIA

(Mr. PERKINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this

found solutions to problems similar to its own.

Improved communications would extend to OSHA's relations with other government agencies. To date there has been an absence of liaison with any of them. Conflicts have even cropped up between OSHA and its own research arm, the National Institute for Occupational Safety & Health, NIOSH develops the criteria documents on which OSHA bases its standards, and in the past there has been no joint order of priorities. NIOSH, for example, conducted extensive studies to develop a criteria document on heat stress, only to discover the issue was so far down on OSHA's list of priorities that work has still not begun on the standard. Corn has already established monthly meetings between OSHA and its research arm to avoid such wasted efforts.

But most of these programs still depend on adequate funding and staffing. To bolster his new emphasis on health, Corn plans to freeze the number of safety compliance officers at 1,030 until it is matched by the roster of health inspectors. In fact, he wants to set up a special unit to respond to emergency situations, such as the infamous Kepone case in Hopewell, Va. A former employee of Life Science Product Co.'s Kepone plant alerted OSHA to health problems with the chemical long before the extent of workers' illnesses became known. But OSHA inspectors, more turned to safety problems than health, originally gave the complaint low-priority status.

But even if Corn gets the money to enlarge the health payroll—which he by no means certain—he may find it impossible to recruit capable employees. OSHA has only 135 fully qualified industrial hygienists and an almost equal number in various stages of training. Both Corn and his regional administrators are having trouble filling even those slots for which money is available. "We've been recruiting hard, but there's a real scarcity of industrial health professionals," complains David J. Rhone, OSHA's Philadelphia regional inspector. "I would guess there are fewer than 4,000 people in the U.S. who are truly industrial hygienists."

Still, Corn is getting good response from his field people on the campaign to stress health. During the first quarter of this year, Rhone's inspectors found 2,818 workers who were being exposed to 31 different toxic substances. "We're headed in the direction Dr. Corn wants to go," Rhone says.

OSHA's field staff also likes Corn's emphasis on real rather than crumped-up hazards. Flatiron, for example, points to the selective concentration programs as proof of OSHA's new effectiveness. He cites a sharp reduction in the number of construction workers killed in trench cave-ins. OSHA has always required that trenches in construction projects be adequately shored. Nonetheless, until 1973 Massachusetts alone had a 40-year average of five workers killed in trench accidents each year. Then OSHA selected this standard for concentrated enforcement. The result: only two fatalities in Massachusetts in more than 30 months.

#### A SERVICE GROUP

Such efforts might help improve OSHA's image as an effective policeman, but the agency would mean a policeman nonetheless. Corn's idea calls for more radical change. He wants to build a concept of the agency as a service group, with a consultation wing that is totally distinct from the inspection and citation functions. But to do this requires Congressional authorization—and this may be hard to get.

The problem is that OSHA's enabling legislation requires inspectors to issue citations for all serious violations, and warnings for all less serious infractions, on their first visit. Every year amendments to the law have been proposed to allow citation-free consultations, but none has passed.

Corn sees the ability to consult as vital to the agency's future. Otherwise, he maintains, there is just not enough money available for OSHA to do an effective job. "We need something more to stimulate businessmen to police themselves," he says. "The agency should be able to provide guidance to an employer, not just come at him after the fact with a stick."

Corn faces Congressional opposition on the issue from both supporters and detractors of the agency. The original sponsors of the act fear that once it is opened for one amendment, the agency's opponents will introduce additional, more limiting restrictions. A meager ray of light appeared this year, when the House approved the consultation operation. But the Senate is keeping obstacles to the revision in place.

To reach the Senate floor for a vote, the measure, known as the Taft amendment after its original sponsor, Robert A. Taft Jr. (R-Ohio), must first be brought up before the Committee on Labor & Public Welfare, chaired by Harrison A. Williams (D-N.J.). Williams, a cosponsor of the original OSHA legislation, leads those reluctant to open the law up to destructive tampering. "To establish consultation in addition to inspection would be enough to create a bureaucracy of very considerable proportions," he maintains.

Williams' stand is backed by organized labor. Most union leaders support Corn, but not support stops short of consultation. "We realize that many of the steps he has taken are aimed at making OSHA more effective, but we can't go along on this one," says George Taylor, the OSHA specialist at the AFL-CIO. "It smacks too much of the weaknesses that caused state attempts at OSHA-type programs to fail."

#### BUSINESS IS DISTRUSTFUL

Ironically, even if the consultation amendment were put into law, Corn might find that his biggest hurdle remains in the private sector. Many businessmen simply do not trust OSHA enough to use agency employees for consultation. For example, in some 20 states, federal OSHA programs have been supplanted by state programs which, under OSHA's enabling legislation, are funded half by the states and half by the federal agency.

Some of these states have set up consulting services for business, but clients are often sorely lacking. California, for one, has state-level consulting program, and Dr. Giorgio's Wilson explains why it often goes unused. When Jerry Brown was elected governor in 1974, he says, "the mandate came down to go out and find violations." The aggressive attitude on the part of the state inspectors left industry with a sour taste. "We're supposed to be able to ask for help without fear of being cited, but we've never been able to believe that," Wilson says.

The seeds of industry's distrust have been amply sown throughout OSHA's five-year life. Even Corn agrees that the agency's history has elevated "getting off on the wrong foot to a near art form." Worker well-being was an issue in the U.S. long before OSHA. Child labor laws were passed; the Walsh-Healy Act went into effect, specifying health and safety practices to be followed by companies doing business with the government; a sprinkling of exposure standards were passed for isolated industries, such as beryllium processing. But it still took until 1970 for the government to pass the truly comprehensive Occupational Safety & Health Act. Almost immediately the infant law was buffeted by political winds.

OSHA first came to life midway in President Nixon's first term, and became a victim of Nixon's push for decentralization of government. The whole concept of a national drive for worker safety and health was fragmented from the outset. "The Administration was not committed to enforcement," recalls Daniel H. Krivit, the House labor sub-

committee counsel who worked on passage of the original OSHA act. "It was committed to decentralization, so OSHA was splintered into seven regions that became nearly autonomous at the outset."

The immediate result was that seven sets of inspectors set off in seven different directions, with no standardized inspection procedure—and with total freedom to select those safety standards that each wanted to stress. Some 4,000 existing industry standards were adopted wholesale at that time. George C. Guenther, OSHA's first administrator, tapped the existing Walsh-Healy standards, as well as those formulated by the American National Standards Institute. Now Corn is left with the legacy of those hastily produced standards. "The reasons for adopting them may have been good at the time, but they have been loaded with time bombs," he says.

Replacing the 4,000 quack standards with more workable, OSHA-created ones may prove a formidable task. Only three of OSHA's health standards have made it onto the books—those for asbestos, a group of 14 carcinogens, and vinyl chloride. Standards development has traditionally been impeded by industry suits charging that they are too rigid, and lately by labor suits charging they are not rigid enough.

#### LABOR SUFFERS CON

At least some congressmen are trying to get a more objective view of OSHA's performance, and one that relies on statistics rather than politics. Freshman Representative Edward W. Fattison (D-N.Y.) recently sent a questionnaire to 2,000 employers in his district and divided the responses into two groups: those whose plants had been inspected by OSHA and those whose plants had not. Of the first group, 83% said that compliance with OSHA standards did not cause them undue economic hardship, and 94% of the second group agreed. And although 45% of those who had never been inspected agreed with a questionnaire statement that "imposition of OSHA standards serves the purpose of protecting the safety of workers," the agreement figure jumped to 78% for employers who had been inspected.

The survey, which was published in April, indicates that there may be a sizable "silent majority" in industry that is ready to throw its support to OSHA. One labor leader believes that the overwhelming vote of confidence registered in Fattison's survey "probably shows a strong liberal tendency among the responding industries. It is the anti-OSHA conservatives who are vocal in their condemnation of OSHA," he says, "while those who support it have grown tired of fighting and are usually unheard."

Fattison also sees it a bit differently. One of them says: "The businessmen in our district were visited by competent, helpful inspectors, and now they feel they can relax. They look on OSHA now in the light of the problems it was created to deal with."

But Corn does not seem able to use the favorable results to his advantage. Last month, for example, he briefly described his proposals for simplifying safety standards to a meeting of Senate legislative aides. He threw the session open for questions, only to find that each side wanted to dwell on constituents' complaints about OSHA. Corn, his voice tinged with exasperation, told Business Week, "There are 100,000 inspections every year [out of 4 million existing businesses]. In 1% the inspector may get high-handed or make a silly but possibly well-intended misjudgment. Yet it is this 1% that continues to distort our whole program and the good that is being accomplished."

Appointed federal officials, rather than elected ones, are sympathizing with Corn's plight. "Politicians tend to get a lot of applause when they pick on OSHA," says Stanley E. Morris, deputy associate director of the Office of Management and Budget and an

STAT

Approved For Release 2003/01/29 : CIA-RDP79M00467A000400020005-1

Approved For Release 2003/01/29 : CIA-RDP79M00467A000400020005-1